<div align="center">REMARKS</div>

The Non-final Office Action dated June 15, 2006 was considered and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1, 5, 18, and 24 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-43 and 72-74 are pending.

Claim 72 was not addressed in the previous office action. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the next office action be non-final.

Claims 1, 2, 8-43, and 74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swartz (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0028363) in view of Friedman (U.S. Patent No. 6,167,455). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites automatically maintaining a sequence of places visited with the computer system by a user, the sequence including places visited by a plurality of different applications, where the sequence is maintained by automatically adding the places to the sequence when the user visits the places, and where the places in the sequence are ordered according to the order in which they are visited.

Swartz fails to teach or suggest these features. Rather, Swartz merely discloses a user manually depressing a "hot key" to add File Snapshots to a File Snapshot List 304. The File Snapshots are manually added to the list by the user after depression of a "hot key" but are not automatically maintained, the sequence including places visited by a plurality of different applications.

Friedman also fails to teach or suggest automatically maintaining a sequence of places visited with the computer system, the sequence including places visited by a plurality of different applications. Friedman merely discloses a software application 116 in which a user may execute operations on the software applications 116. See col. 4, line 1 – col. 5, line 7 and col. 1, lines 10-20, cited by the Office Action. Operations are performed on a signal software application 116. Friedman fails to teach or suggest maintaining a sequence of places, the sequence including places visited by a plurality of

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 09/502,970
Attorney Docket Number: 130718.01
Filing Date: February 11, 2000

11/21

different applications. In fact, Friedman fails to teach or suggest a sequence of places visited with the computer system at all.

Swartz also fails to teach or suggest the places in the sequence being ordered according to the order in which they are visited, the sequence including places visited by a plurality of different applications. In Swartz, a log file is "dynamically modified to contain the information about all documents that are currently open and the applications that they reside in" (paragraph 0035). When an application is closed in Swartz, "handles that are no longer valid in memory are removed from the log file 403." Paragraph 0066. Therefore, Swartz does not maintain a sequence of places visited. Rather, Swartz maintains, in no particular order, a list of places currently open in applications.

Friedman fails to cure this deficit of Swartz. As set forth above, Friedman merely discloses a user performing operations on a single software application 116. Friedman therefore fails to teach a sequence including places visited by a plurality of different applications and being ordered according to the order in which they are visited.

Claim 1, as amended, recites providing a first selection mechanism while displaying a first place corresponding to a first application and navigating from the first place to a second place corresponding to a second application responsive to a user–input selection via the first selection mechanism, wherein the first application and the second application are adjacent applications in the sequence.

Swartz discloses a user pressing a hot–key to capture a data representation of an accessed file onto a Snapshot Navigator Menu 301 (see, *e.g.*, FIG. 3 and paragraphs 0005, 0034, and 0036). The user clicks on the data representation ("file snapshot 305") (paragraph 0047) causing the corresponding file to be brought to the foreground and made active (paragraph 0050). Swartz fails to teach or suggest navigating from a first place (corresponding to a first application) to a second place (corresponding to a second

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 09/502,970
Attorney Docket Number: 130718.01
Filing Date: February 11, 2000

12/21

application) responsive to user input wherein the first application and the second application are adjacent applications in the sequence.

A log file in Swartz is "dynamically modified to contain the information about all documents that are currently open and the applications that they reside in" (paragraph 0035). When an application is closed in Swartz, corresponding "handles that are no longer valid in memory are removed from log file 403" (paragraph 0066). Thus, Swartz does not maintain a sequence of places visited, rather Swartz maintains, in no particular order, a list of places currently open in applications. As such, Swartz fails to teach or suggest a sequence at all.

Friedman fails to cure the deficits of Swartz. The Office Action asserts that Friedman discloses claim 1 at col. 4 line 1 – col. 5, line 7 and col. 1, lines 10-20. However, Friedman merely discloses a software application 116 in which a user may execute an operation (e.g., printing, copying, pasting data, changing attributes, etc) (col. 4, lines40-55; col. 1, lines 13-20). In addition, synchronous operations directed at two data objects may be performed by the user via the software application (col. 4, lines 56–61). An example provided is a drag and drop operation (col. 4, lines 61-63).

However, Friedman, like Swartz, fails to teach or suggest navigating from a first place (corresponding to a first application) to a second place (corresponding to a second application). Indeed, Friedman merely permits users to execute operations on one application but fails to teach or suggest navigating to another application at all. Having failed to teach or suggest a first application and a second application or navigating from a first place corresponding to the first application to a second place corresponding to the second application, Friedman also fails to teach or suggest that the first application and the second application are adjacent applications in the sequence. In fact, Friedman fails to teach or suggest the sequence (of applications) at all.

Also, Friedman, like Swartz, fails to teach or suggest a first selection mechanism for navigating from the first place to the second place. Friedman fails to teach or

suggest navigation from the first place (of a first application) to the second place (of the second application) and therefore cannot teach or suggest a selection mechanism for navigation from a first place to a second place.

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim features must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). Because the combination of Swartz and Friedman fails to teach or suggest all the claim features as set forth above, it is respectfully submitted the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Claim 25 was rejected "with the same rationale as claim 1." See Office Action, page 7. As set forth above, Swartz and Friedman, either alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest claim 1. In addition, claim 25 further recites displaying, as part of a display of a first application, a first link associated with the sequence of places according to the sequence; and in response to a signal indicative of a selection of the first link, displaying a recent places page including a representation of the sequence of places. Neither Swartz nor Friedman, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggest these features.

As set forth above, Swartz merely discloses capturing a data representation of an accessed file onto a Snapshot Navigator Menu 301 and causing a file corresponding to the data representation to be brought to the foreground and made active (paragraph 0050) responsive to a user selecting the data representation. However, Swartz fails to teach or suggest displaying a first link and in response to a selection of the first link, displaying a recent places page including a representation of the sequence of places. Instead, Swartz merely discloses displaying a File Snapshot Menu 301 (paragraph 0030) without a representation of the sequence of places. Swartz fails to teach or suggest a sequence of places at all.

Likewise, Friedman fails to teach or suggest these features. Friedman merely discloses a software application 116 on which a user may perform operations. This is unrelated to displaying a recent places page.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted claim 25 is allowable over the cited references. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 29 is similar to claim 1and is allowable for at least the reasons set forth above for claim 1. In addition, claim 29 recites simultaneously displaying, for each of the applications, a representation corresponding to the application, such that the representation is displayed as part of at least one of the applications; and in response to a signal indicative of a selection of one of the representations, displaying the sequence of places that have been visited by the application.

Swartz fails to teach or suggest these features. Swartz merely discloses a user pressing a hot–key to capture a data representation of an accessed file onto a Snapshot Navigator Menu 301 and selecting the data representation to cause the corresponding file to be brought to the foreground and made active. As FIG. 2 illustrates, a panel of data representations (element 301) is displayed, each data representation corresponding to a respective window of an application (elements 401, 402). As set forth above, Swartz merely provides a list of places currently open in applications in no particular order. Swartz fails to maintain a sequence of places visited.

Even assuming *arguendo* that the data representations (FIG. 3, 304) are in some order, nowhere does Swartz teach or suggest a sequence of places that have been visited *by the application*. Indeed, Swartz fails to teach or suggest an application visiting a sequence of places at all much less maintaining the sequence of places visited by the application.

Friedman fails to cure the deficits of Swartz. As set forth above, Friedman merely discloses a user performing operations on a software application 116. Friedman fails to teach or suggest a plurality of applications, simultaneously displaying, for each of the

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 09/502,970
Attorney Docket Number: 130718.01
Filing Date: February 11, 2000

15/21

applications, a representation corresponding to the application, such that the representation is displayed as part of at least one of the applications. In fact, Friedman fails to teach or suggest displaying a representation of an application simultaneously with an application at all. Likewise, Friedman also fails to teach or suggest displaying (responsive to a signal) the sequence of places that have been visited by the application. Friedman fails to teach or suggest displaying anything at all.

Claim 37 recites automatically maintaining a sequence of places visited by a user in order of visitation, and, for each place visited, maintaining place information including a reference to first executable code for displaying the place; and a reference to a data object that is bound with the executable code to display the place; altering the data object in a second executable code so as to form an altered data object; and in response to a request for the place, binding the altered data object and the first executable code and displaying an altered place. The Office Action cites Swartz at paragraphs 0005–0009, 0032–0035, and 0043 for providing these features. However, contrary to the Office Action's assertion, Swartz fails to teach or suggest any of these features.

As set forth above, Swartz fails to teach or suggest automatically maintaining a sequence of places visited by a user in order of visitation (See comments above).

In addition, Swartz at paragraphs 0005–0009 discloses using graphical representations of documents and applications in a Snapshot Navigator Menu, storing interfaces to files on mass storage devices, switching between applications by clicking a mouse (on the graphical representations), and creating template documents for applications. At paragraphs 0032–0035, Swartz discloses creating a duplicate copy of a File Snapshot 305 so that users can open pre-formatted files, displaying desktop icons in a Snapshot Navigator Menu 301 to make them accessible to a user, retrieving a document from storage or switching the focus to a document that is already open by selecting. Also, a log containing information on all open files is maintained. At

paragraph 0043, Swartz discloses adding an application (and filename) to the Snapshot Navigator Menu 301 if the documents are not already in a log. Also, the File Snapshot List 304 is updated with the new application handle and filename and document filename and handle.

Notably, in none of the cited paragraphs or anywhere else in the reference does Swartz teach or suggest a reference to first executable code for displaying the place, a reference to a data object that is bound with the executable code to display the place, altering the data object in a second executable code so as to form an altered data object, or in response to a request for the place, binding the altered data object and the first executable code and displaying an altered place. The Office Action appears to generally cite paragraphs 0005–0009, 0032–0035, and 0043 as supposedly containing this disclosure despite the complete lack of the claim elements in the cited paragraphs.

The Office Action fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 74 is similar to claim 1 and is allowable for at least the reasons set forth above for claim 1.

Claims 2, 8–24, 26–28, 30–36, and 38–43 depend from claim 1, 25, 29, or 37 and are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above for claims 1, 25, 29 and 37.

In addition, claims 12 and 30 recite each of the representations for each of the applications comprises a representation of a place most recently visited by the application. Swartz merely discloses a user capturing (by depressing a hot key) a snapshot of a file and adding the snapshot to a file list. A screen capture of the document is transferred to the File Snapshot (paragraph 0036). Hence, the screen capture is a static image and is not updated to reflect the most recently visited place by the application.

The Office Action cites Swartz, paragraph 0072 for providing this feature. However, Swartz at paragraph 0072 merely discloses categorizing the files "in

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 09/502,970
Attorney Docket Number: 130718.01
Filing Date: February 11, 2000

17/21

chronological order." The Office Action contends that "in chronological order" means "a representation of a place most recently visited by the application." Applicants disagree. Paragraph 0072 of Swartz, as a whole, discloses that a user may categorize files in a particular (chronological) order. However, this does not mean that representations of the files comprise a representation of a place *most recently visited* by the application. Rather, in Swartz, a static image of a file is captured at one point in time, this process may be repeated for other files, then the files are categorized by the user in chronological order (paragraph 0072). Nowhere does Swartz teach or suggest that the files reflect a "representation of a place most recently visited by the application."

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 12 and 30 is respectfully requested.

Claim 14 further recites in response to a signal indicative of a second selection of one of the representations, displaying places that have been displayed in the application. Claim 33 further recites displaying a recent places page that displays the places that have been displayed in the application. Swartz and Friedman, either alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest these features. The Office Action relies on Swartz at paragraphs 0032–0035 to provide this disclosure. However, contrary to the Office Action's assertion, Swartz fails to teach or suggest this feature.

At paragraphs 0032–0035, Swartz discloses creating a duplicate copy of a File Snapshot 305 so that users can open pre-formatted files. Creating a duplicate copy of the snapshots is unrelated to displaying places that have been displayed in the application. At best, even if the duplicate copy of the snapshots were to be displayed, Swartz would merely disclose displaying the snapshots corresponding to each of the open applications on the computer. However, Swartz would still fail to teach or suggest displaying places that have been displayed in any of the applications themselves.

Swartz (in paragraphs 0032–0035) also discloses displaying desktop icons in a Snapshot Navigator Menu 301 to make them accessible to a user. This is also unrelated to displaying places that have been displayed in the application. At best, Swartz merely

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 09/502,970
Attorney Docket Number: 130718.01
Filing Date: February 11, 2000

18/21

discloses displaying desktop icons on a computer. The desktop icons are not disclosed as being places that have been displayed in any of the applications themselves. Indeed, they are not.

Swartz (in paragraphs 0032–0035) also discloses retrieving a document from storage or switching the focus to a document that is already open by selecting (an icon). This is also unrelated to displaying places that have been displayed in the application. Swartz merely discloses activating a file by retrieving the file from data storage. If the file is already open but is not active, then the file is brought to the foreground. However, Swartz still fails to teach or suggest displaying places that have been displayed in the applications themselves.

Also, Swartz (in paragraphs 0032–0035) discloses maintaining a log containing information on all open files. This is clearly unrelated to displaying places that have been displayed in the application.

Contrary to the Office Action's contention, the cited paragraphs of Swartz fails to teach or suggest claim 14 or claim 33. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 14 and claim 33 is respectfully requested.

Claim 21 recites the second application comprises overriding the display information so as to display the place in the second application in accordance with drawing functions provided by the user interface. The Office Action relies on Swartz, paragraphs 0032–0035 to provide these features. However, contrary to the Office Action's assertion, Swartz fails to teach or suggest these features.

At paragraphs 0032–0035, Swartz discloses creating a duplicate copy of a File Snapshot 305 so that users can open pre-formatted files. Even if the created duplicate copy of the snapshots were to be displayed, Swartz still fails to teach or suggest overriding the display information so as to display the place in the second application. Also, Swartz fails to teach or suggest drawing functions provided by the user interface.

Swartz (in paragraphs 0032–0035) also discloses displaying desktop icons in a Snapshot Navigator Menu 301 to make them accessible to a user. This is also unrelated to overriding the display information so as to display the place in the second application. Clearly, this disclosure in Swartz is also unrelated to any drawing functions provided by the user interface.

Swartz (in paragraphs 0032–0035) also discloses retrieving a document from storage or switching the focus to a document that is already open by selecting (an icon) and maintaining a log containing information on all open files. This is also unrelated to overriding the display information or drawing functions provided by the user interface. Swartz fails to teach or suggest drawing functions at all.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 21 is respectfully requested.

Claims 3–7 and 73 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swartz and Friedman and further in view of Aragon (U.S. Patent No. 6,055,327). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 3–7 and 73 depend from claim 1. As set forth above, Swartz and Friedman, either alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest claim 1. Aragon is cited by the Office Action as disclosing a back and forward button. Even assuming *arguendo* that the Office Action's assertion is proper, Aragon still fails to cure the deficits of Swartz and Friedman with respect to claim 1, nor does the Office Action assert that Aragon does.

It is therefore respectfully submitted claims 3–7 and 73 are allowable over the cited references. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above Application is requested. Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully requests that

the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,
Microsoft Corporation

Date: September 1, 2006

By: _____

Stephen C. Siu, Reg. No.: 48,303
Attorney for Applicants
Direct telephone (425) 704-0669
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399